ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.
ED001934	N.A.	N.A.

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S): The State Education Commissioner's Advisory Committee on Human Relations and Community Tensions, New York, New York

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:

Desegregating the Public Schools of New York City

6. PUBLICATION TITLE:

N.A.

7. EDITOR(S):

N.A.

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: State Education Commission's Advisory Committee on Human Relations & Community Tensions, New York, N.Y.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN

ORG. State Education Commissioner's Advisory Committee on Human Relations & Community Tensions, New York,

ST. / CITY, STATE: New York

TELE. / EXT. / INST/LOC CODE

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	5/64	59

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE: YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED: YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED: YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT: PROPOSAL ☐ IN-PROGRESS ☒ FINAL ☐ FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: Report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

open enrollment	ethnic groups	special schools	teacher recruitment
transfer policy	zoning	education complexes	equalized facilities
student support	desegregation	school-community relations	
	personnel role	community tensions	teacher advancement

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

The Advisory Committee evaluated such existing desegregation efforts as open enrollment, zoning, the free choice transfer policy, feeder pattern changes, and pairing proposals. They decided that desegregation would not be effective unless other measures were undertaken.

Recommendations included establishing comprehensive four-year high schools built at points well outside existing ethnic ghettoes, establishing fifth-through eighth-grade middle schools, extending primary units from prekindergarten through fourth grade, forming educational complexes, equalizing facilities, stabilizing and improving the staffing of the schools, improving the recruitment and advancement of minority group teachers and other personnel, establishing special schools and programs, and requesting State and Federal support, both fiscal and administrative.

Appendices, with many tables, were included.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OR PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

2

ERIC Form 1

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PRINTED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NEW YORK--NEW YORK CITY

ED001934

DESEGREGATING THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF NEW YORK CITY

A REPORT PREPARED FOR THE
BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK

NY

By

The State Education Commissioner's Advisory Committee
on Human Relations and Community Tensions

May 12, 1964

Prepared with the assistance of
The Institute of Urban Studies
Teachers College, Columbia University

Office of Education-EEOP
Research and Materials Branch

DESEGREGATING THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF NEW YORK CITY

A REPORT PREPARED FOR THE
BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK

By

The State Education Commissioner's Advisory Committee
on Human Relations and Community Tensions

May 12, 1964

Prepared with the assistance of
The Institute of Urban Studies
Teachers College, Columbia University

U17-J164-5000

Office of Education-EEOP
Research and Materials Branch

Table of Contents

	PAGE
Commissioner's Letter of Transmittal	i
Committee's Letter of Transmittal to Commissioner James E. Allen, Jr.	iii
Preliminary Correspondence	vi
Introduction	ix
Findings and Recommendations	1
Appendix I—Tabular Data on School and Student Ethnic Composition	31
Appendix II—Proposed Educational Complexes	41

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY
AND COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
ALBANY

The Honorable Members of the Board of Education
and the Superintendent of Schools
The School District of the City of New York
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Dear Sirs:

Pursuant to your request of last February, I am pleased to transmit herewith the findings and recommendations of the special committee appointed by me to evaluate the Board's plan for improving education through integration.

The report recognizes integration as a part of the larger issue of improving the schools and sees in the need for dealing with integration the opportunity and challenge for raising the quality of the entire school system—with the aim that equality of opportunity shall everywhere mean excellence of opportunity.

The Committee has done a thorough, workman-like job with special emphasis on the gathering of facts upon which to base their conclusions.

I transmit this report with the expectation that it will stimulate immediate, direct, decisive action by the Board and the Superintendent. I am sure you are aware that the uncertainties now prevailing must be removed and that decision and plans of action for the 1964-65 school year must be made clear.

The resolution of the problems of the schools of New York City is vital to every aspect of life in the City, State and Nation, and the Board should seek and receive the assistance of appropriate governmental offices, of the leaders of business and civic organizations and of the people generally.

The initiative, however, lies with the Board and the Superintendent, and the greatest hope and asset for wise action lies in their willingness, determination and their dedication to the achievement of better education through integration.

I wish to thank the Committee—John H. Fischer, Kenneth B. Clark, and Judah Cahn—and the able staff who assisted them, for the competent way they have carried out their difficult assignment. Giving unstintingly of their time and talent, at great personal sacrifice, they have rendered a service which deserves the appreciation of all the people of the City and State.

On behalf of the Board of Regent and the State Education Department, I pledge our continued assistance in every way in which the Board and Superintendent feel we can be of help.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. ALLEN, JR.
State Commissioner of Education

May 8, 1964

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON
HUMAN RELATIONS AND COMMUNITY TENSIONS
JOHN H. FISCHER, CHAIRMAN
JUDAH CAHN
KENNETH B. CLARK

261 MADISON AVENUE, ROOM 1500
NEW YORK 16, N.Y.
MU 7-3513

May 1, 1964

Dr. James E. Allen, Jr.
Commissioner of Education
The University of the State of New York
The State Department of Education
Albany 1, New York

Dear Mr. Commissioner:

On February 21, 1964, following a request from the President and Superintendent of the New York City Board of Education, you asked our Committee to evaluate the Board's plan for improving education through integration.

It seemed to us essential to begin with the relevant facts, and we therefore arranged for Professor Robert A. Dentler, Executive Officer of the Institute of Urban Studies at Teachers College, Columbia University, to undertake the necessary research. He and his staff provided us with an analysis of the ethnic composition of every school in New York City, showing the present situation and changes over the past five years. For a representative sample of schools and districts, projections were made of the direction and extent of change that may reasonably be predicted by 1970 and by 1980. The factors contributing to the population change in each of the boroughs were analysed and proposals were made for dealing positively with the consequent problems. Summaries of the data developed by the Institute are included in this report and the full documents, which are too voluminous for publication, will be filed in the office of the Superintendent of Schools.

The Research Division of the State Department of Education prepared for us a digest of earlier programs carried on by the City Board of Education to improve integration and instruction.

While these studies were under way, the Committee met with Superintendent Gross, the Board of Education, and representatives of many organizations interested in civil rights and education.

The problems of desegregating and improving the schools of New York City can be dealt with only when they are seen against the broader objective of making and keeping New York City a community in which intelligent, discerning, and responsible parents will choose to raise their families. This cannot be done, however, without a number of changes in the schools, of which the first and most important is to provide first-rate teaching for every child in every section of the city.

In addition, the need is urgent to expand and improve the supporting services that undergird and supplement the teacher's work. School plants must be built in larger numbers and more rapidly than in the past. Teaching materials must be improved and furnished more promptly and flexibly. As earlier studies have repeatedly pointed out, the administration of the New York City schools must be decentralized if initiative, originality, and imagination are to be encouraged on as wide a scale as is necessary to cope with the complex and varied tasks the schools face. Decentralization should not, however, become the means to erect regional barriers separating segments of the city. It should not, for example, be used as an excuse to keep children in one administrative unit from entering another if there are good educational and social reasons to warrant such transfers.

The changes we have proposed do not in every case require additional funds, but many do and the additions will have to be substantial. If the New York City schools are to be as good as they must become, the average expenditure per pupil may have to be raised a third or more over present levels. In the absence of more realistic budgets most of the good things the schools need will either be impossible or will have to be so meagerly done as to produce virtually no effect upon the City as a whole.

The money problems of the New York City schools must be faced squarely and responsibly by city, state, and national leaders. Because New York City is so important to the entire country the national aspect of its problems must be viewed as in part a Federal responsibility. At issue here is far more than how to build a few schools or raise teachers' salaries another notch. The whole question of New York City's future as a place to live is now being answered.

The challenge of finding the ways and means to finance the public schools properly must be accepted not only by the appropriate governmental officers but equally by those leaders of the business community and other segments of city life whose influence so often stimulates and ratifies the major decisions of government. It would be a disgraceful commentary on the values by which we live if the financial capital of the free world should find itself unable to marshall the talents, the money, and the foresight to underwrite the development of its own most precious and promising resources.

We conclude this assignment and submit our report to you with no sense at all of a task finished. We can only hope that our work may have uncovered further facts that must be taken into account and may have shed additional light on promising courses of action. The responsibility for the effectiveness of the New York City schools continues to rest locally with the Board of Education, the Superintendent, and the professional staff. They in turn must be able to count upon the support of the citizens. As State Commissioner, your assistance can be useful in the future as it has been so often in the past, but if the American tradition of local control of schools is to be maintained in New York City, the initiative and most of the energy required must be provided locally.

Finally, we record our appreciation and gratitude to all who cooperated so generously to make our work possible. These include the members of your own staff, and of the staff of the City Board of Education. Most especially, we record our indebtedness to Professor Dentler and to Mr. Richard P. Boardman of his staff. Their performance has exceeded any reasonable definition of professional or civic duty. They have been imaginative, industrious, and indefatigable. Whatever merit this report may have is due largely to their excellent and faithful work. Mr. Theron Johnson, of the State Department of Education, who has worked closely with our Committee since its appointment has, as usual, been indispensable.

To you we express again the respect and esteem with which we view your distinguished leadership. It has inspired us steadily throughout our work as it does all who deal with the difficult problems of human relations in our State.

Faithfully yours,

JUDAH CAHN
KENNETH B. CLARK
JOHN H. FISCHER, *Chairman*

PRELIMINARY CORRESPONDENCE

TELEGRAM – CC – REGENTS & CABINET – 2/8/64

COMMISSIONER JAMES E. ALLEN.

AS WE MOVE FORWARD TO IMPLEMENT THE BOARD'S PLAN FOR IMPROVING EDUCATION THROUGH INTEGRATION, WE WOULD BE HAPPY TO HAVE YOU SET UP PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATING THE PRACTICAL ASPECTS OF THE PLAN IN ORDER TO ASSIST US IN OUR DIFFICULT TASK. ALL MEMBERS OF THE BOARD WOULD WELCOME SUCH A STEP.

JAMES B. DONOVAN
PRESIDENT
BOARD OF EDUCATION OF NEW YORK CITY
CALVIN E. GROSS
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, NEW YORK CITY

REPLY TO JAMES B. DONOVAN & CALVIN E. GROSS – 2/8/64

RE YOUR TELEGRAM. I WILL OF COURSE COMPLY WITH THE BOARD'S REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE IN ACHIEVING YOUR OBJECTIVE OF IMPROVING EDUCATION THRU INTEGRATION. I AM CONSIDERING WAYS IN WHICH THIS ASSISTANCE CAN BEST BE GIVEN. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE EFFORT BE A JOINT ONE INVOLVING ALL INTERESTS IN THE SITUATION AND IT WILL BE MY AIM TO SET UP A PROCEDURE WHICH WILL MAKE THIS COOPERATION POSSIBLE.

JAMES E. ALLEN, JR.

PRELIMINARY CORRESPONDENCE

LETTER

The President and Members of the
Board of Education and Superintendent of Schools
City School District of the City of New York
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York

Dear Sirs:

On February 7, in a telegram signed by President Donovan and Superintendent Gross, the Board of Education requested that I set up procedures for evaluating the practical aspects of the Board's plan for improving education through integration. I replied on February 9, that I would comply with the Boards request, and would give consideration as to how I might best be of assistance.

Since receiving your request, I have spent many hours in New York City and elsewhere meeting with individuals and representatives of interested groups, listening to many points of view and attempting to assess the situation. I am grateful to all those who met with me for their frank opinions, and helpful suggestions.

Two years ago, I established a committee of knowledgeable and experienced persons to advise me generally on matters of human relations and community tensions affecting education. This committee consists of: Dr. John H. Fischer, President Teachers College, Columbia University, Dr. Judah Cahn, Metropolitan Synagogue, New York City, and Dr. Kenneth Clark, Professor of Psychology at the College of the City of New York, and Research Director of the Northside Center for Child Development, New York City. I have decided to ask this committee to evaluate the practical aspects of the Board's plan as you have requested.

As the Board itself has recognized, however, integration is but one part of the much broader problem of school improvement. To consider one without the other is to ignore the vital relationship. No effort to improve integration can then, I believe, be fully successful without a more intensive and extensive effort to deal not only with the problems involved in integration, but with all the other problems which influence the provision of equality of educational opportunity for all children and youth in the city.

Therefore, I am asking my committee not only to consider the practical aspects of the Board's integration plan but to consider also how the plan

might fit into a comprehensive program for the improvement of education for all young people in all sections of the city.

The conditions of our time have so magnified the problems and needs of urban education that we have reached a point where, despite the significant progress and efforts now being made, these problems and needs are going to have to receive treatment on a scale much larger, much more imaginative and far more intensive than ever before tried. The committee is being asked then at the same time to explore what the best means might be for formulating a program of such magnitude.

The problems of the schools are not only educational ones but ones which affect all aspects of life in the city. The effects of good schools in New York City—or the lack of them—is felt throughout the entire community, and the state and nation as well. Hence, broad involvement of interested persons and groups, private as well as governmental, within the city and without, is a necessity, and I am requesting the Committee to consider how such involvement might be achieved.

I shall see that the committee is provided with the necessary funds and staff assistance and shall assume, of course, that Superintendent Gross and his staff will also be available as well as all relevant information in the Board's possession. Procedures will be established by the Committee to secure the viewpoints and advice of the major groups interested in education and integration in the city, of leading authorities in these fields throughout the nation, and of other persons whose knowledge and judgment could be of help.

The Committee has been requested to submit to me a report of their conclusions and recommendations by early in May. They will get in touch with Dr. Gross immediately.

The approach suggested has great potential and I hope that all those interested in education, and in the city's future, will realize the importance of this opportunity, and will give their full cooperation.

Through the efforts of the Board and its staff, important advancement is being made in the schools of the city. I trust that the procedures suggested in this letter will be of help in accelerating the further progress which is so essential to the welfare of the city, state and the nation.

Sincerely,

James E. Allen, Jr.

INTRODUCTION

In compliance with the request of the Commissioner of Education of the State of New York, this report by the Commissioner's Advisory Committee on Human Relations and Community Tensions evaluates the past efforts and current plans of the New York City Board of Education and its staff to desegregate the public schools. The report also proposes additional ways by which desegregation may be accomplished and the programs of the schools simultaneously improved.

At the request of the Committee, the Institute of Urban Studies of Teachers College, Columbia University prepared background studies of the changing ethnic composition of the City schools, the ecology of the school system, and population trends in the region and the City. The full results of these studies under the title "Data Book on New York City Public Schools" are on file in limited numbers in the offices of the State Department of Education in Albany and in New York City.

While the studies were under way, the Committee conferred with a number of interested community groups and with the Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools. Following the compilation of the demographic data and the conferences, the Committee and the Institute staff worked together to examine the probable viability and soundness of a number of proposals for achieving better and desegregated schools.

While the views expressed in this report are those of the Advisory Committee presented with unanimous agreement, we must acknowledge that many of the ideas reflected in the report did not originate with us. Those who have worked with the problems of urban schools will recognize single elements, broad schemes, and a variety of combinations of suggestions put forth by persons in New York City and elsewhere. We acknowledge our indebtedness to many, but accept for ourselves the full responsibility for what is offered in the pages that follow.

Two reasons compel us to do our best to achieve well integrated schools. One is the moral imperative to assure all children true equality of opportunity. The other is the educational necessity to prepare every child to take his place in a world where no race may any longer live alone. The desegregation of the public schools of

New York City, therefore, means more than a better education for minority children. It means also a significant addition to the educative power of the schools for all children.

To argue that no classroom can be good without a white child in it is inaccurate and cruel. But, it cannot be denied that a child who has learned from experience to understand and appreciate people of races other than his own has a sounder basis for both this education and his life. The cultural and ethnic diversity of New York City which has long been one of its principal assets now offers a priceless opportunity if we can but muster the ingenuity to turn it to the advantage of the schools and the children.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

GENERAL PREMISE

Efforts to improve teaching and other school services are a necessary part of any sound effort to desegregate the schools. Desegregation without improved instruction could produce equal but poor education for all. On the other hand, improved instruction without real desegregation could not contradict the fact that when schooling has been separate, even if only *de facto,* it has almost invariably meant *de facto,* unequal education.

Superintendent Calvin Gross stated in December, 1963:

> The entire school integration program may be summarized under two headings; the achievement of equality of education and vocational opportunity for all children, and particularly those of minority group status; and the promotion of ethnic integration. These two complementary approaches have formed the warp and woof of efforts to improve the education of Negro and Puerto Rican children in New York City—efforts which have absorbed a major share of energy of the school system for more than nine years.

Throughout its work our committee has been concerned with both objectives, but this report deals chiefly with the promoting of ethnic integration. We prefer, however, to speak of desegregation rather than integration or ethnic balance, since the segregated school is the evidence of the difficulty and must therefore be the target of the corrective effort.

The earliest possible elimination of *de facto* school segregation should be the overriding concern of all responsible groups and authorities.

The aim of this report is to evaluate past programs and current plans for ethnic desegregation of the New York City public schools and to propose further steps to that end. If these steps are to succeed they must be accompanied by immediate, far reaching, and intensive new efforts to raise the quality of instruction in all the schools, beginning with those now most urgently in need of improvement.

We are aware of and appreciate the various actions of the Board of Education to improve instruction in public schools in depressed areas, to recruit more teachers from minority groups, to consider Negro and Puerto Rican personnel for advancement to

administrative positions, and to introduce remedial, guidance, and other special services into the system as counterforces to the effects of increasing segregation over the last several years. Many of these efforts are commendable. Some are like several of our recommendations in intent, if not in substance or scope.

We believe that such improvements are essential *but must be combined with effective steps toward desegregation.* This report confines its evaluation for the most part to desegregation policies; and, while we have reviewed past efforts of the Board to desegregate, we are also concerned with educational programs that advance beyond where the system is at this time. We have assumed that the Board's present efforts at improving instruction and personnel will continue.

DEFINING PUBLIC SCHOOL SEGREGATION*

In developing this evaluation, we sought an unequivocal definition of the ethnically segregated public school. After considering alternatives, we chose to define a public school in *New York City* as ethnically segregated if, in 1963, it enrolled less than 10% Negroes and/or Puerto Ricans, *or* if it enrolled less than 10% from other groups. For clarity we refer to others as White, despite the imprecision. (The terms, Puerto Rican and White are most doubtful, since most Puerto Ricans were classified as Whites in the 1960 Census. Our use of "Whites" ignores the fact that the word "Other" included Oriental-Americans, Indian-Americans, etcetera. Nevertheless, we employ the three terms, Negro, Puerto Rican, and White on the ground that they are fairly accurate and commonly understood.) Three types of schools result from this definition:

1) *White Type.* A *white* type school is one enrolling more than 90% Others, here termed Whites, and fewer than 10% Negroes or Puerto Rican pupils. This, under our definition is a *segregated* school.

2) *Desegregated Type.* A *desegregated* school is one enrolling fewer than 90% Negro and Puerto Rican pupils, and 10% or more Whites. By our definition, this school is *desegregated* since at least 10% of its students are Negroes and Puerto Ricans and another 10%, at least, are Whites.

---

* Note: Our data in this report refer to *regular,* day-type elementary and secondary schools. "600" and other special schools are excluded. This, and the periodic regrouping of schools, explain differences in our figures that appear in one or two places in this report.

3) *Negro-Puerto Rican Type.* A school enrolling more than 90% Negro and Puerto Rican pupils, is defined as a *segregated* school of the Negro-Puerto Rican type, because less than 10% of the student body is White.

Our definition is exact, if arbitrary, and seems to us reasonable in the light of the present facts in New York City. A criterion of larger magnitude in a city in which more than *half* the first and second graders are Negro or Puerto Rican would be unrealistic. Moreover, if a larger interval were accepted, it would not greatly affect the critical category of Negro-Puerto Rican Type segregated schools: Under the criterion of 10% we used, 22% of the elementary schools in the city were minority segregated in 1963. Under a 20% criterion, this increases to 29%; and under a 30% criterion, this increases to 31%. Thus our 10% standard contains 131 elementary schools, while the apparently much wider 30% criterion would include 183. Our standard includes nearly ¾ of this 183. The 10% standard, incidentally, was the one used in the Public Education Association's 1954 study of the New York Schools, and it was employed most recently in a distinguished analysis of segregation in the Chicago public schools.

EARLY DESEGREGATION EFFORTS

The New York City Board of Education in 1954 appointed a committee to examine the racial composition of the public schools and to recommend actions to achieve racial integration. This Committee recommended in 1958 that three mechanisms be employed: zoning, site selection and construction, and pupil redistribution. An Advisory Council on Zoning was subsequently formed, but there is no evidence that it effected any lasting results, although several new schools were built and some older ones modernized in ethnically mixed as opposed to segregated neighborhoods. The Commission's recommendations on the redistribution of pupils through "permissive zoning" and busing were not implemented.

OPEN ENROLLMENT IN NEW YORK CITY

On the basis of experience during 1959 with the transporting of children from schools in the heavily segregated Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn to mixed schools in Queens, the Board of Education introduced a plan for Open Enrollment.

The Board introduced a larger Open Enrollment program which permitted students with the consent of their parents to transfer out of segregated schools by the Fall of 1963. A total of roughly 16,000 students were affected or less than 1% of all students in the public system as a whole, or about 3% of the Negro and Puerto Rican student population.

Open Enrollment has had no significant effect on the extent of segregation. It *cannot* have, as it depends wholly upon voluntary choice among Negro and Puerto Rican parents. In September, 1964, for example, when the program was revised and enlarged, about 110,000 elementary pupils were offered the opportunity to transfer. Of this number, about 2,000 applied, and some 1,800 were in fact transferred—an impact of less than 2% of those given the option.

ZONING

The Board made about 100 changes in district and school zones in order to stimulate desegregation between 1959 and 1963. In addition, the Board permitted more than 600 individual exceptions, called zoning variances, for high school attendance in the same period. These changes, together with those summarized above, constitute *all* notable efforts by the Board and its staff as of 1963 to reduce the level of *de facto* segregation among students in the city's public schools.

EVALUATING EFFECTS OF PAST EFFORTS

Data have been gathered on the ethnic composition of the schools only since 1958. If past efforts of the Board have affected the level of segregation, the effect should be measurable—however slight—by comparing the 1958 data with those from 1963. [Any change in school segregation noted in our figures must be qualified. First, the underlying data are to some degree inaccurate, since they are based on visual judgments of classroom teachers as to each child's ethnicity. Secondly, about 5% of *any* increase in segregation is attributable to ethnic changes in school and city populations. Thus, if schools changed in percent segregated from 10% (1958) to 20% (1963), we would estimate that half of this change was inevitable. Had they

declined from 20% to 10%, we would conclude that Board efforts might have had up to a 5% effect.]

The fraction of Negro-Puerto Rican Type segregated schools in New York City increased over the 5 years from 12% to 22% at the elementary level, from 10% to 19% at the junior high level, and from 0% to 2% at the senior high school level.

About ¾ of the city's schools did not change in percent Negro or Puerto Rican during the same period. Among the ¼ that did change, however, nearly all increased very substantially in percent Negro or Puerto Rican. *Despite Open Enrollment, rezoning, and associated efforts, segregation, city wide, has not been reduced. On the contrary, the overall level of segregation has increased.*

No act of the Board of Education from 1958 through 1962, with a single small exception, has had a measurable effect on the degree of school segregation. This exception may be at the senior high school level. Although there are White Type segregated high schools, as of 1963 only one high school was clearly identifiable as a Negro-Puerto Rican Type segregated school. This is the Girls' High School in Brooklyn, which, under the Board's recent plan, will be abandoned. Benjamin Franklin High School, which was 11% White in 1963, has also received Board attention in an effort to improve its situation.

About 78 public schools below the high school level became segregated between 1958 and 1963. (The number will vary slightly depending upon the classification of certain schools that were combined during the period.) A judgment as to whether Board efforts *slowed* the rate of school segregation in this period would require more detailed data from the years 1953 through 1963, but *our impression is that not a single elementary or junior high school that was changing toward segregation after 1958 by virtue of residential changes and the transfer of Whites into parochial and private schools was prevented from becoming segregated by Board action.* There were schools whose composition was changed toward desegregation during this period, but they appear to be located in neighborhoods where urban renewal, relocation and redevelopment involved the displacement of families. Of the Board's desegregation activities [during this period] only the Open Enrollment program was large in scale. It affected only previously segregated schools—and even there, too few pupils to modify the trends.

EVALUATION OF 1964-1970 SCHOOL BUILDING PROGRAM

The Board has adopted a program for erecting new buildings and renovating old ones during the next 6 years and beyond. Of the 44 projected for action in 1964 and 1965, about 20 are located at points *outside* existing, overcrowded residential ghettoes. A statement in explanation of the site selections prepared by the Board's Planning and Research Division helps interpret this fact:

> A more helpful perspective would be achieved if we viewed the budget from the vantage point of providing desperately needed additional accommodations to achieve a full day in badly overcrowded areas of the city. From this viewpoint, the Board of Education is recognizing these needs and taking steps to satisfy them.

The school building program as presently set forth reinforces substantially the historic pattern of building on sites within the most segregated areas. This is the case chiefly in Negro residential areas, but it is also true in some mainly White neighborhoods, and thus helps to intensify both forms of segregation.

To date, desegregation has not been a main factor in the programming of construction and physical renovation. Building plans have developed in response to population increase, age and quality of existing plant, transport conditions, and site availability. If the purpose to desegregate was considered at all, it apparently was ranked in importance below these other considerations.

EVALUATION OF THE FREE CHOICE TRANSFER POLICY

The Board announced late in 1963, a Free Choice Transfer Policy. This permits any child in a school with a "high" percentage of Negroes or Puerto Ricans to transfer, at his parent's request, to any other school where space is available.

This Policy improves upon the Open Enrollment Plan. The Board intends, for instance, to define space available "liberally," that is, at something more than 100% of rated capacity. In addition, the standard for a "high percentage" of minority students will be lowered "progressively" over the years. And, unlike the Open Enrollment Plan, once a school qualifies under the new policy, *any* student in it may apply for a transfer.

In our judgment, the Free Choice Transfer Policy, whatever its other merits, and we think it has some, will probably have no city-wide effect on the level of segregation. It is an optional, not a required program. It puts the burden for desegregation entirely on the voluntary and individual decisions of Negro and Puerto Rican parents. A handful of Whites may elect to use the program, but generally the policy will tend to operate in but one direction: minority children will transfer out of Negro-Puerto Rican Type segregated schools. The total enrollment of such schools may decline a bit, but they will not gain White students and therefore will not be desegregated as a result of the policy.

EVALUATION OF THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL FEEDER PATTERN CHANGES

The Board of Education plans to change the pattern of elementary schools feeding into junior high schools. Specifically, the Board proposed 10 such changes and then reduced this number to 6, out of a total of 132 regular junior high schools.

The number of Negro-Puerto Rican Type junior high schools in the city increased from 12 in 1958, to 25 in 1963; or from 10% to 19% of all junior highs. At the same time the White Type junior high schools declined from 43% to 22%. In numbers of students, about 45% of the city's Negro and Puerto Rican youths attended segregated junior high schools in 1963.

The 6 Feeder Pattern Changes proposed by the Board would *reduce* the percent of segregated junior high schools from the present 41% to 39%. At this rate of desegregation, and ignoring natural population changes in the interval, the junior high school system would be desegregated by about the year 2010.

If a great effort were made to desegregate the 25 junior high schools which are now Negro-Puerto Rican Type schools, the new policy could make a difference within a single decade. Such an effort is not proposed by the Board of Education.

EVALUATION OF PAIRING PROPOSALS

The chief innovation made by the Board in 1964 was the location of 21 areas where elementary schools might be paired. Under this policy, two schools in proximity would be so organized that each

building would be used for selected grades for all pupils in the combined zones of the two schools.

In 1958, 12% of all elementary schools were Negro-Puerto Rican segregated, compared with 22% in 1963. If all 21 of the pairings proposed by the Board were to be introduced at once in 1964-65, this fraction of 22% would drop to 21%. *The pairing proposal thus would reduce minority school segregation in the city by 1%, if introduced all at once.* Not only have many of the proposed sites been withdrawn following local opposition, however, but the Board proposed to make only 4 such pairings in September, 1964.

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION OF BOARD PROPOSALS AND EFFORTS

We must conclude that nothing undertaken by the New York City Board of Education since 1954, and nothing proposed since 1963, has contributed or will contribute in any meaningful degree to desegregating the public schools of the city. Each past effort, each current plan, and each projected proposal is either not aimed at reducing segregation or is developed in too limited a fashion to stimulate even slight progress toward desegregation.

Our data suggest that present conditions and immediate possibilities are relatively most favorable at the senior high school level. Here, the system is ⅔ desegregated. However, nearly ⅓ of the high schools continue to be of the White Type. Many of these are the most advantaged schools in the system, and Board policies have not addressed the task of desegregating these "choice" institutions.

At the elementary school level, the Board has done nothing and proposed no plan that would reduce current levels, or stem the rising tide of segregation.

With no special policies, Negro-Puerto Rican Type segregated elementary schools will tend to grow from 22% of all the schools in 1963 to 31% in 1970, to perhaps 38% in 1975. We estimate that the pairing of some 20 elementary schools a year—presuming a very active extension of the Board plan—would yield a system that would still be 24% minority segregated in 1970.

The feeder changes proposed for junior high schools would have merit, if the proposed annual rate of change were increased

by about 3 times, and if chief attention were given to minority rather than to White Type segregated schools.

SOME UNDERLYING FORCES

Before advancing alternative suggestions, we wish to describe the population changes which have historically characterized the social situation in New York City, and are likely to do so in the future. Any planning on so vital an educational issue as desegregation should be done, we believe, on the basis of full knowledge of the total community situation.

Public school ethnic segregation is less severe in New York City than in most major central cities such as Philadelphia, Chicago, and Detroit. In Chicago, for example, 37% of all elementary schools were Negro Type segregated in 1963, compared with 22% in New York City; and 18% of the high schools were Negro segregated, compared with 2% in New York City.

The ethnic minorities are numerically larger in New York City; and residential segregation is different in pattern. Chicago's population was 23% non-white in 1960, where New York City's was 22% Negro and Puerto Rican. However, the numerically smaller Chicago minority was crowded for the most part into *one* elongated "Black Belt." New York City's ghettoes are more dispersed; indeed, there are 7 large, circle-shaped ghettoes in non-contiguous areas. In any case, *de facto* school segregation is not unique to New York City. It is rather a major social problem in most large and many smaller northern metropolitan communities.

De facto segregation in public schools cannot be attributed to intentional policies of the Board of Education in New York City. Given the prevalence of the neighborhood school principle under which urban public schools are organized, and which continues to be preferred by most parents, school segregation is a by-product of patterns of segregation in settlement and housing.

Two great migrations form the basis for public school segregation in New York City today. The greater of the two is the movement of Negroes from the South. In 1910, 89% of the nation's Negro population resided in the South. In the same year, only about 100,000 or 1% of the total resided in the New York metropolitan

area. By 1960, nearly 1.3 million Negroes, or about 6% of the nation's Negro population, had settled here. In the 50 years from 1910 to 1960, while the number of Negroes in the United States approximately doubled, the number of Negroes in the New York urban area multiplied *ten times.*

The second great migration has been the movement into the city and its area of Puerto Ricans. The Puerto Rican population grew from less than 1% to nearly 6% of the urban area population between 1940 and 1960. Both migrations will continue, though at a decreasing rate, for the rest of this century.

As the Negro and Puerto Rican populations in New York City have increased, other groups have spread outward to the perimeters of the city and into its suburbs. This change also continues. *About ⅕ of the city population was Negro and Puerto Rican in 1960. About ¼ will be in 1965; the fraction may expand to ⅓ by 1970.*

The 20% Negro and Puerto Rican residents of the city in 1960 were crowded into extremely overpopulated, segregated sections of the city. The Puerto Ricans have dispersed gradually since 1955, but Negroes continue to be confined chiefly to 7 residential ghettoes. New little islands have started elsewhere, but real dispersion is rare.

For the public schools, this situation is intensified by more than the departure of whites, or more advantaged groups, from the city. Residential segregation and a rapid thinning of whites is further confounded by the fact that New York City parents have the option of choice among public, private and parochial schools. Because the latter are overwhelmingly white in composition, and because the number of these schools has grown substantially since 1950, the overall fraction of Negroes and Puerto Ricans in the public schools far exceeds their representation in the city population at large. The percentage of minority children is also larger in the lower grades than at the upper levels. In the Bronx, for example, in 1960 when 25% of all residents were Negro or Puerto Rican, 43% of the students in the public schools were of those groups. In the elementary schools, 51% were from the two minorities. This difference is attributable not so much to size of family or birth rate (as is often believed), but rather to the fact that the more recently arrived households of Negroes and Puerto Ricans are younger than their white neighbors, and therefore have younger children.

Three present population trends are likely to continue to affect New York City no matter what policies are adopted for the public schools. First, the proportion of public school pupils who are Negro and Puerto Rican will continue to increase. *We estimate that minority pupils will exceed 50% in 1965, 66% in 1970, and 70% in 1975.* Secondly, these increases will be differentially distributed. The Manhattan schools already have 73% Negro and Puerto Rican pupils. The Queens schools will not reach the 40% to 50% interval until about 1980. Third, within each borough, unless unforeseen changes occur, this increase will continue to take place under patterns of residential segregation. As White Type segregated schools remain persistently under-utilized in many places, Negro-Puerto Rican Type segregated schools will continue to become overcrowded.

All three trends add to the difficulty of forming a policy for effective desegregation. The continuing overall decrease in the white component of the school population further reduces the possibility of easy improvement. Moreover, the wide differences in the various sections of the city require different policies in different sections. Most painfully, overcrowding in the residential ghettoes makes many efforts to desegregate futile, for distance and population concentration work against nearly all forms of redistribution. Many features of this population process are beyond the control of either the Board of Education or any other agency of city government.

White New Yorkers do not move out of the city simply because of prejudice. White migration to the suburbs results from many economic, social and familial forces. The migration *out of the region,* largely White, is a response to the rapid rates of growth in the West and Southwest areas of the nation.

An increase in the ratio of Negroes and Puerto Ricans to whites in city public schools helps to *precipitate* movement out of the public schools and out of the city. When ethnic imbalance occurs, all three broad ethnic groups lose, educationally and socially. As the rate of in-migration rises or imbalance reaches a certain level in relation to the distribution of residents in the neighborhood around a public school, non-Puerto Rican and other Whites tend to remove their children from it and minority segregation inevitably follows.

This pattern of White exodus from the public schools has proceeded in Washington, D. C., Newark, New Jersey, and perhaps else-

where, to the point of near-total segregation. In less than 10 years, for example, the Washington public school pupil population changed from about ⅓ to more than ¾ Negro. They may well be 9/10 Negro by 1970.

The trend toward school segregation has been and will continue to be slower in New York City. There are several reasons for this prediction. New York City is much larger than Washington and Newark, and its adults are employed in much more widely diversified occupations. For these and other economic and structural reasons, New York City can absorb a numerically greater amount of ethnic change than other cities without the change being reflected as dramatically or extremely in overall statistics. New York City can also "hold" a greater proportion of its White families for a longer period than can other cities.

Another important consideration is the balance between private and public schools. About 70% of the city's White students were in public schools in 1960, compared with 86% of its Negro students. Stated another way, there are about 1.4 million White and Negro students enrolled in schools in New York City. Of these, about 400 thousand are in private and parochial schools; and of these, only 32 thousand (less than 10%) are Negroes.

Most of the 32 thousand are in schools operated under the auspices of Roman Catholic and Episcopal Churches, which together account for nearly ¾ of the city's private school students.

Our data lead us to predict that, in the absence of significant efforts by the Board of Education and other groups and agencies, the New York City public schools by 1980 will enroll about 70% to 75% Negro and Puerto Rican pupils and that the proportion may be expected to stabilize at that level.

Even though no action by the Board of Education can prevent the growth of minority population, wise and intelligent policies can contribute substantially to preventing extreme school segregation. What occurs when firm preventive steps are not taken is all too obvious: when a city school system moves from ethnic balance to extreme segregation, the quality of its instructional services is undermined as support, both lay and professional, declines. Aggressive policies designed to desegregate the schools and improve instruction simultaneously can, in contrast, make such a period of ethnic change one of *heightened* confidence in public education.

The options available to New York City are not unlimited but they are real. Total desegregation of all schools, for example, is simply not attainable in the foreseeable future and neither planning nor pressure can change that fact. Yet if nothing more is done, or too little is attempted, the outcome will inevitably be more extensive and more extreme segregation and a larger number of poor schools. More can be done, however, and should be. With thoughtful planning, bold policies and vigorous action, there are sound reasons to believe that the spread of segregation can be slowed, its severity reduced, and the effectiveness of school programs substantially improved.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

By the definition used in this report, the proportion of segregated schools in the public school system may be expected to increase between 1963 and 1975 from 22% to 38% at the elementary level, from 19% to 29% at the junior high school level, and from 2% to 6% at the high school level, *unless* steps far more comprehensive and effective than those currently proposed by the Board of Education are taken promptly.

Some remedies that have been suggested are both impractical and educationally undesirable. Among these is long-distance transportation of elementary school pupils. This device appears to promise the greatest immediate change in *de facto* segregation, but in many cases it is more likely to have a negative effect. Residential segregation in Brooklyn for example, is so extreme that some 70,000 Negro and Puerto Rican children, aged 5 through 11, would have to be transported twice daily on trips as long as that from Brighton Beach to Fulton Street, some 10 miles or 50 city bus minutes away. In Manhattan, because of an even higher proportion of Negro and Puerto Rican children, even greater amounts of transport would not effect integration. The same condition holds (but in a lesser degree) for the Bronx and Queens.

Persuaded by the fact, however, that *there are steps which could be taken by the Board to desegregate the public schools,* we sought ways to reduce segregation and at the same time improve education. As our earlier interpretation of the city ethnic trends reveals, we believe that part of the educational desirability of any plan at this

time must be its *mutual* acceptance by both minority groups and Whites. It should be obvious, but does not always appear to be, that integration is impossible without White pupils. No plan can be acceptable, therefore, which increases the movement of White pupils out of the public schools. Neither is it acceptable, however, unless it contributes to desegregation. Our criteria for devising proposals are therefore these: (1) genuine, prompt reduction of school segregation; (2) improvement in the quality of educational services; and (3) retention and, if possible, attraction of more White pupils.

It is our considered judgment that a major reorganization of the school system is required in order to achieve within a period of the next ten to fifteen years the twin goals of high quality schools and the greatest possible degree of desegregation.

The data on the ethnic composition of schools indicates most clearly that even a comprehensive desegregation plan will not eliminate all segregated schools. Our proposals will, however, reduce the number of them and retard the spread of segregation. They will also increase the proportion of Negro, Puerto Rican and White children who will have the opportunity for integrated experience in good schools.

HIGH SCHOOLS

The maximum degree of desegregation can now be achieved at the high school level. This possibility can be realized by the more effective use of existing plants and the strategic selection of sites for new buildings. Toward this end, the Board of Education should introduce a large scale program of construction and development of *four year comprehensive high schools.*

We recommend that these high schools include grades nine through twelve, absorbing ninth grades now assigned to junior high schools. We recommend further that to accommodate the ninth grade students, and to relieve overcrowding from the already anticipated increases in grades ten, eleven, and twelve, the high school construction program be revised.

Most of the new four year comprehensive high schools should be located at sites in the north Bronx and in predominantly White neighborhoods in Brooklyn and Queens. These are the three boroughs that are now moving most rapidly toward predominantly Negro and Puerto Rican public school populations. Within ten years, therefore,

comprehensive high schools located in now white neighborhoods will in all likelihood, be centers of desegregated communities outside the ghetto. *The first step to be taken would be to revise the planned locations of the five high schools projected by the Board of Education for construction in 1964 and 1965. At least four of these are now projected for location in heavily segregated residential areas.*

Comprehensive schools on well selected sites would provide a significant counterforce to the present slow but evident trend toward segregated high schools. They will do this by redistributing students now segregated by reason either of their residence or of the curricula they are presently pursuing. At present 78% of the pupils in academic high schools are Whites, while only 52% of the pupils in vocational high schools are Whites. The programs of the new high schools should be planned to assure a suitably high level of general education for all students. Such vocational courses as are to be continued should be distributed among the comprehensive schools rather than concentrated in wholly specialized vocational units. While some special-purpose schools may well be justified, the policy should be to eliminate those in which attendance seems to imply a stigma, or which show a trend toward increasing racial homogeneity.

We recommend further that all high schools should be open to all students on a city-wide basis with no restrictions except those needed to prevent the over-crowding of particular schools.

In short, this proposal would seek to promote the desegregation of the high schools and to meet the educational needs of all groups by introducing schools that are neither too general nor too specialized to adapt to changing occupational and cultural conditions. An additional advantage of including the ninth grade in the high schools is that this grade contains a larger proportion of minority students than the tenth through twelfth grades. The four year organization will accordingly yield a better ethnic balance and will increase the number of students who will have the opportunity for integrated educational experience.

THE MIDDLE SCHOOL

In order to extend the process of desegregation to the lower grades and at the same time improve the educational opportunities for children we recommend the establishment of new *middle schools* to include grades 7 and 8 of the present junior high schools and

grades 5 and 6 of the present elementary schools. At present there are 25 Negro-Puerto Rican Type segregated junior high schools; there are 29 White Type segregated junior high schools. The junior high schools represent a concentration and intensification of the effects of segregation.

For the immediate future most middle schools should be located in former junior high schools renovated for their new purpose. Their ethnic mixtures, especially in the ghetto fringe areas, can approach desegregation because students would be drawn from predominantly White as well as predominantly Negro and Puerto Rican elementary schools, and because increased equity of distribution will make this possible.

All of the segregated junior high schools should be eliminated. Of the 25 in this group, more than half are situated in the deep centers of the several residential ghettoes. Elimination of junior high schools should begin at the fringes of the ghettoes, going in as deeply as transportation and the effective organization of the complexes described later will allow. Over the period from 1965 through 1970, the abolition of junior high schools could make a substantial contribution, particularly to preventing future growth in the number of upper level ghetto schools. While some segregation will remain in the middle schools, it might be possible to so organize the cluster of primary schools which feed each middle school to increase the racial heterogeneity of most of these middle schools.

(See discussion of *Education Complex* below.)

The program of the middle school should be planned to meet the educational needs of older children through increasingly diversified and specialized instruction. The upper grades of the middle school would be expected to resemble the better parts of the junior high school. Giving the seventh and eighth grades the status of being the senior members of their school communities may be expected to reduce some of the adjustment problems that have so long plagued the junior high school. Middle school students would also begin their exposure to secondary education earlier, yet not be subjected to the undesirable peer models provided by so many ninth graders in the current junior high school system, models of antagonism and indiffer-

ence toward school induced by the onset of adolescence combined with a lack of preparation for or hope about movement into senior high school. Middle schools and four year comprehensive high schools may in combination contribute to reducing the citywide problem of drop-outs from high school. The middle school should provide strong programs of guidance and such other special services as may be needed and should give close attention to both the special aptitudes and the handicaps of its pupils. As has been pointed out, junior high school buildings may be converted for the use of these units. In the newer plants, relatively few physical changes should be necessary.

The middle school as envisioned in this proposal would receive its students from a combined and clustered set of between two and six primary schools, as described below.

PRIMARY SCHOOLS

We recommend that a new school unit be established to include the first four grades, the kindergarten, and as soon as they can be added, one or two years of pre-kindergarten education. The pre-kindergarten programs should be added first in those neighborhoods where the need is greatest. The primary unit should be centered in the neighborhood and as close as possible to the homes of the children attending it.

Wherever possible, a unit should not enroll more than 500 pupils although where larger buildings are used, as will be necessary in many cases, two or more such units might well be organized in the same building. The reason for proposing relatively small groups is to make it possible for the young child to feel himself a member of his school group, to make it possible for the faculty of the unit to work together as a close knit organization and to enable the parents of the school to work closely with it on a continuous and intensive basis.

The primary unit should be organized on a non-graded basis so as to facilitate the continuous progress of pupils as individuals without arbitrary barriers of grade placement, and time limits. Such an arrangement should also add to the possibility of introducing forms of coordinated or team teaching, variable grouping of pupils and the imaginative use of space, materials, and teaching devices.

The program of the school should be planned to serve both the general educational needs of young children and any special requirements of children in its own neighborhood. The parents should be involved in many ways, including service as volunteers, or where feasible, as part-time or full-time paid assistants. Close liaison should be maintained with the homes through the services of counselors, school social workers, and classroom teachers when they are adequately prepared for this additional duty. Parent education programs should also be developed as a part of the program of the local school, with appropriate staff assistance by specialists.

These neighborhood units will inevitably in many cases be segregated. We recognize the disadvantage of that condition but believe that it is offset by the superior opportunities for teaching and guidance that such a school offers. Since in many neighborhoods integration can be achieved only at the expense of large amounts of travel time and the transfer of a child to a school far from his own home, we believe that on balance the neighborhood primary unit is the more desirable arrangement.

THE EDUCATIONAL COMPLEX

Neighborhood primary schools and nearby middle schools should be combined into clusters that, for want of a more descriptive term, we shall call *educational complexes.* An educational complex will be composed of from two to five primary schools and one or two middle schools. The new organizations should be created first wherever they will contribute to desegregation or better integration. [In Appendix II are listed several possibilities. These are sections of the city where existing neighborhood schools (to become primary schools) are close enough to one another to cooperate closely, or are so situated that the middle schools might be desegregated.]

An educational complex should be administered by a *senior administrator,* who should be given authority and autonomy to develop a program which meets appropriate city-wide standards but is also directly relevant to the needs of the locality. Primary schools within the complex should share among themselves facilities, faculties, and special staff, and should be coordinated to encourage frequent association among students and parents from the several units. Within the education complex teachers will be better able to help children from diverse ethnic backgrounds to become acquainted with one

another. Parent-teacher and parent-school relations should be built on the bases of both the individual school and the complex. The children —and their parents—will thus gain the dual benefits of a school close to home and of membership in a larger, more diverse educational and social community. The concept of the educational complex arises in part from the view that the means of education and much of their control should be centered locally.

Although it may not be possible to desegregate all primary schools, ultimately most of them should be integrated educationally. This will aid the better preparation of students for life and study in the middle school; it will more nearly equalize resources; and it will give the staff in the primary schools new opportunities for innovation and originality in their work.

It may be useful to illustrate the arrangement and operation of schools under our proposals. In District 8 in Manhattan, P. S. 75, P. S. 84, and P. S. 166 are currently desegregated elementary schools in transition toward partial White-Type segregated. They are located near one another and near Junior High School 118. These units would become an educational complex under our recommendations, the ninth graders from 118 being reassigned to the reorganized comprehensive high schools situated outside a ghetto area. Fifth and sixth graders from 75, 84 and 166 would be picked up at designated assembly points and *transported by shuttle bus* to middle school 118, a trip requiring not more than 10 to 15 minutes, or *the average time it now takes children to walk to school.* This policy will prevail in as many instances as possible.

Another illustration: P. S. 189, 219, 156, 175 and 183, in Districts 41 and 42 of Brooklyn are located near one another, and near junior high 252. The entire group is proceeding toward Negro-Puerto Rican Type school segregation, for these schools are on the fringe of the rapidly enlarging Bedford-Stuyvesant community. If no changes are introduced, it is predictable that junior high school 252 will have less than 10% White students by 1970, rather than the present 40% White. The Board of Education proposed for this area a Princeton-type pairing of P. S. 156 with P. S. 210. This would desegregate *one* elementary school but would leave the other schools in the immediate area vulnerable to rapid and extreme segregation. Our plan, in contrast, would mean that the youngest primary children would go to their nearby elementary schools. Thus P. S. 210 would remain

predominantly White, and P. S. 156 predominantly Negro and Puerto Rican. Both sets of parents would, however, be encouraged to *stay on* in the community because a good, stable, and desegregated middle school was at hand.

We recommend further that, as soon as possible, the middle schools should be located in educational parks so situated as to provide children in as many parts of the city as is feasible, the experience of attending a genuinely integrated school during their middle school years. We recognize that for reasons previously pointed out, it may not be possible for some time to assure every child such an experience, but our objective is to bring it about for the greatest possible number. This we think can be accomplished by locating groups of middle schools on large sites designed to accommodate perhaps 15,000 children with administrative units organized so that each child will be a member of a school enrolling 500 to 1,000 pupils. The most practical location for such schools would be in areas where a suitable number of minority group children can be drawn from existing ghetto neighborhoods into parks which will also enroll children from White neighborhoods.

EQUALIZING FACILITIES

Good physical facilities are no substitute for good teaching but they are powerful auxiliaries to it. Obviously, there are limits on the speed with which New York City can reconstruct its gigantic collection of more than a thousand buildings. Many of them are deteriorating and it is essential that more be done to improve the buildings and equipment of the school system, especially in the depressed and s gated neighborhoods. This condition requires immediate and sustained attention.

As of 1963, in spite of the fact that the Board erected many new schools in the last 5 years (26 as replacements for schools within ghettoes), Negro and Puerto Rican segregated schools as a group were still, on the average, the oldest in the city; formed the greatest number of overcrowded buildings, and included the greatest number of buildings in need of modernization or installation of essential facilities.

STAFFING THE CLASSROOM

Desegregation and the prevention of further school segregation alike hinge upon the creation of public schools so excellent that par-

ents of all ethnic groups will enroll their children with confidence and pride. This condition hinges in turn upon the recruitment, certification, supervision, and retention of outstanding classroom teachers.

Without good teaching desegregation is educationally meaningless. Moreover it becomes increasingly impossible to achieve as parents lose confidence in their public schools and as those with higher economic, occupational, and educational attainment can achieve the means to move away. Authentic desegregation is impossible without the progressive provision of improved instruction in the public schools. The proposals for modifying the organization of levels in the schools and for the clustering of units form a basis for such improvenent. A major reconstruction of the sort outlined will introduce *new ncentives* for such teachers. The new *Educational Complexes* can become centers within which exciting professional activity and development is both possible and encouraged. We would go further, however. Many practices of the present city system must be changed drastically if more good teachers are to be employed, attracted to assignments in heavily mixed schools, and retained while they mature toward professional excellence.

For example, more Negro and Puerto Rican teachers and administrators must be recruited and advanced in responsibility as rapidly as their performance justifies. Although the school system does not close any of its positions to members of minority groups, Negroes have had more difficulty than others progressing through the system's hierarchy.

It should be possible to find more than the present group of fewer than 10 Negroes who are competent to handle some of the system's more than 1,200 administrative positions. Surely more than the present 2 or 3 Negroes are capable of outstanding service among the 800 principalships.

It is not enough that selection standards be high and objective. An equally important question is whether they are sufficiently relevant and flexible to obtain people with the qualities most needed in the schools.

We propose, therefore, greater flexibility in the recruitment and examination of school staff members. The Board of Examiners since 1960 has placed somewhat less emphasis on written test performance. This reform should be continued and intensified.

We also propose greater flexibility in the design of the teacher's day. The reports persist that teachers and other staff members are overburdened by paperwork, lack of clerical and technical support, and are subjected to unprofessional regulations that unduly restrict their performance.

The proposed reorganization should be used as an opportunity to correct these conditions. With the development of *Educational Complexes,* middle schools and comprehensive high schools, considerable decentralization will be possible. Within system-wide policies to assure high minimum standards of administration, teaching, pupil services and community relations, decentralization can *release* administrators and teachers from standardized requirements. The local initiative and responsible freedom essential to good schools must be more actively encouraged.

At present, a spurious "reward structure" exists within the staffing pattern of the New York schools. Through it, less experienced and less competent teachers are assigned to the least "desirable" yet professionally most demanding depressed area schools. As the teacher gains experience and demonstrates competence, his mobility upward usually means mobility away from the pupils with the greatest need for skilled help. The classrooms that most urgently need the best teachers are thus most often deprived of them.

With the assignment of a teacher to one of the proposed *Complexes* such transfers would be unnecessary. Within a *Complex* teachers will be able to work with a variety of types of pupils or colleagues. No *Complex* need be a "hardship post" or "ghetto outpost." They can become centers of professional excitement and growth.

This prospect will not be realized, however, merely by changing the organization of schools within the *Complexes.* Serious and sustained efforts will have to be made to achieve equitable assignment of staff, competent supervision, strong support structure, a release from constrictions on local and individual initiative, and maximum racial heterogeneity.

TRAINING TEACHERS

While the Board becomes more flexible and imaginative in its personnel recruitment efforts, as we believe it has since 1961, it must also look more closely at its *training* resources.

For example, arrangements must be made so that student teachers may take their practice in schools that are well mixed ethnically, and even predominantly Negro and Puerto Rican. To accomplish this, the college auspices under which the professional education occurs must be strengthened substantially. Virtually every one of the city's public and private higher educational institutions has experimented with programs for teachers planning to enter big city schools. Most of these efforts remain under-financed; only a few are more than tentative pilot projects; and too few provide any solid basis for close cooperation with the public school system.

In order for these new programs in teacher preparation to succeed, more than a few courses in urban sociology are needed. State and federal as well as city funds must be channeled into cooperative research and development activities to involve colleges and universities more effectively on the work of the urban school system. The major training institutions should not be devoted as consistently as they have been to the preparation of teachers for suburbia.

PRE-PRIMARY PROGRAMS

Harvard psychologist Thomas Pettigrew has commented, "Fourteen generations of Negro talent have already been wasted by American society; our technological society cannot afford to waste yet another." If the talents of the young are to be cultivated and preserved, the process must, under modern conditions, not only take longer; it must also start sooner. The outstanding educational program necessary to prevent further segregation of schools and children in New York City, moreover, depends upon high levels of aspiration and school-type achievement among a larger proportion of children. The talents of New York City children must, therefore, be cultivated earlier than ever before. Only a new, *citywide* program of pre-kindergarten education will stimulate this change.

There are two reasons why we urge that the Board of Education introduce on a large-scale basis a pre-primary program of instruction. First, it is at this level that what we have elsewhere called *compensatory* education can have a significant impact. The materially or socially deprived child can gain most from extra enrichment at the age of 3 and 4. This program is both compensatory and preventative. It would cost less and have greater benefits than remedial programs for adolescent dropouts.

We recommend that the pilot projects in pre-primary instruction be adopted progressively throughout the city, beginning first within the *Educational Complexes and* in the centers of ghetto areas. The Board of Education should be encouraged to cooperate closely in this activity with the City Department of Welfare's Division of Infant Day Care Centers, which can provide additional starting points for this program.

SPECIAL SCHOOLS

Few objective data are available on the programs of the special schools but, what evidence we do have suggests that these schools, particularly the 600 schools, have grown at a rapid pace in recent years. The functions they are designed to serve remain vague. We could find, for example, *no* clear statement of the present curriculum for these schools. And the available data indicate a disproportionate number of minority group students in these schools. The plans for the newer programs for special students seem, in Junior Guidance classes and After-School programs, similarly unclear.

Special schools seem often to be set up deliberately outside the neighborhood where their students live. The rationale offered is to release the child from his antagonistic surroundings without embarrassing him by special placement in his own neighborhood schools. Actually, this arrangement also removes the child from his family, neighborhood, peers, and normal school experience. Although he is officially defined as a special problem, he is also treated as if he were autonomous and responsible enough to *commute* to a distant school. The arrangement, to say the least, raises serious questions.

Similar questions must be raised about educational provisions for the mentally retarded. Gerhart Saenger in his report, *Factors Influencing the Institutionalization of Mentally Retarded Individuals in New York City,* said in 1960, that "More than half of the recently institutionalized low grade retarded children came from Puerto Rican and Negro families, even though these groups together make up slightly less than one-quarter of the population of the city." Saenger also identifies probable serious errors in the diagnostic and referral systems leading up to institutionalization.

The total numbers of disturbed, maladjusted, and retarded students in the city's public schools are very small compared with the total student population, yet we believe that the *educational quality*

of a school system can be assessed to an important degree by the treatment it affords the most disadvantaged, the needy, and deviant groups of children and youth. We do not have adequate facts about special educational programs in the city. It appears that such information has not been secured by the school system itself.

We therefore propose that objective, independent studies be made of the care and schooling of special students in the city's public school system, and the results published. We also propose that *special educational programs be closely related to the neighborhood primary school and the middle school.* Children with emotional and social handicaps should increasingly be dealt with as those with physical handicaps are. If a student is not principally an invalid, a *medical* patient, or a hazard to his school mates, he should be educated with his peers or at least within the same school building. If the child's primary problem is medical or one requiring custody, the responsibility for him should rest with an agency other than the school.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

These proposals are advanced as a *minimum* program of changes that are necessary if the Board is to reduce and prevent school segregation. The proposals may be modified in their particulars, but their combined magnitude and import is, if anything, an understatement of what must be done to achieve desegregation in New York City schools.

Can the New York City public school system, already burdened with excessive fiscal problems, achieve these goals? One response is the logic of crisis: As Commissioner Allen wrote about New York's school system in 1962, "In many ways, possibly in most ways, the future of the metropolis is being written in its classrooms today. Unless what is being done now is done better, and unless much, much more is done that is now being done, that future will be a bleak one in many respects."

The second answer is that more is at stake in New York City than the future well being of a single city. The public school students of this community form more than ⅓ of the total public school enrollment of New York State. A large part of the State's responsibility for the welfare of its youth is concentrated here.

The third consideration is that among all the great cities of the North, New York's public schools stand a better social chance of achieving authentic desegregation than possibly any of the others. This city is comparatively free of the forces of social and political reaction against full civil rights. This city has a heritage of cultural innovation and educational progress. If school segregation cannot be fought effectively here, if the public school children of New York City must be relegated to second class status for lack of energy and effort, the nation will have reason to despair.

In view of the enormity of both the problem and the possibilities, *we propose that both the State and Federal governments be urged to demonstrate their deep involvement through progressive increases in fiscal support. When municipal initiatives toward substantial change are demonstrated, and as they are introduced, substantial financial assistance and technical cooperation will be essential.* It is doubtful that without large scale additional State and Federal support, the necessary reforms can even be successfully begun, much less thoroughly completed.

THE TEST OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

An effective program of desegregation will be very costly. It will require funds not available from within the public economy of New York City, to be sure. Yet, there are steps that can be taken by the Board of Education and by the Superintendent of Schools and by others that will not require extra funds. *Decisions and actions on these, we suggest, should become the test of whether the city's educational policy makers seriously intend to reduce and to prevent further segregation.*

The fact that outside support must be obtained to accelerate desegregation should not become a reason for inaction. Indeed, it is probable that when the Board of Education initiates its own revised program, significant outside help will materialize. The steps that can be taken now and over the coming year without additional outside funds, include the following.

1. The 5 high schools already projected by the Board for construction and already capitalized could be relocated outside minority ghettoes and redesigned to become comprehensive high schools. This would set the precedent for future secondary school construction.

2. Junior high schools feeding the new comprehensive high schools, other new junior high schools for construction, and selected junior highs from the list of *Educational Complexes* contained in the appendix to this report, should be chosen for conversion into middle schools. This conversion could be accomplished, we believe, without great extra expense within the next year. Later, additional conversions would require further funds.

3. A first series of *Educational Complexes* could be created around the newly formed middle schools cited above. These would require complicated administrative and faculty reorganization but no important addition to expenditures.

4. Openings for Negro and Puerto Rican teachers and administrators can be widened immediately without extra expense.

5. Greater flexibility and autonomy can be provided to the principals and their staffs within the new *Educational Complexes.*

6. Newly strengthened cooperation between teacher training institutions and the Board can be developed over the next year with no important additional expenditures of funds.

7. Studies and policy reviews of the organization of special educational services, especially for the socially maladjusted and the mentally retarded, can be initiated at no important additional cost.

Prompt decisions and vigorous action on these items will demonstrate the clarity of purpose, the firmness of commitment, and the determination to succeed that the entire community is waiting to witness and eager to applaud.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF REPORT

A. *Findings:*

1. Puerto Rican, Negro and other students in public schools in New York City suffer extensive and serious ethnic segregation.

2. This segregation increased between 1958 and 1963, and will continue to increase over the next 10 to 15 years, unless deliberate policies are introduced to reduce current levels and prevent future increases in segregation.

3. The Board of Education has made efforts between 1954 and the present which were intended to reduce segregation. These efforts have had *no* measurable effect upon the overall number of students attending segregated schools or upon the number of segregated schools in the system.

4. Early in 1964, the Board of Education introduced new proposals intended to aid in desegregating the public schools. The new proposals, considered singly and in combination, would *not* reduce current levels of school segregation or prevent future increases.

5. Ethnic segregation cannot be wholly eliminated from the schools of New York City in the foreseeable future, but the adoption of wise and intelligent policies can reduce segregation substantially. The basic requirement is a deep and sustained commitment on the part of the Board and its staff to the purpose of reducing segregation throughout the city at the earliest time and at the fastest possible rate.

6. The adopted building program of the Board does *not* treat *desegregation* as a main factor in choosing sites, although this factor could be utilized.

7. Wise and intelligent policies to foster desegregation must include intensified efforts to raise the quality of school program and teaching in New York City schools to the highest level, which is to say a degree of excellence second to none in the United States. The purposes of desegregation and increased excellence must be pursued simultaneously. They are absolutely interdependent.

8. The real accomplishment of both objectives is a complicated, costly, and difficult undertaking. It is far beyond what many advocates of change have seemed willing to recognize or acknowledge. Basic changes in the present organization of the school grades and the revision of construction programs are essential to desegregation and improvement, as are new concepts of recruitment, faculty involvement, curriculum design, pupil services, administrative operation, plant use, and inter-school communication.

B. *Recommendations:*

1. Comprehensive four year high schools should be built at points well outside existing ethnic ghettoes, to be attended by commuting youths from points all over the city as well as by local residents.

2. Fifth through eighth grade middle schools should replace junior high schools ultimately in the entire system. The purpose of these units should be to furnish improved instruction for older children. They should be so located as to provide for as many children

as possible an experience in an integrated school. Shuttle buses should be used to reach these middle schools.

3. Primary units extending from pre-kindergarten classes through the fourth grade should replace existing elementary schools. These units would still be neighborhood schools, but they would be organized differently and would feed into the middle schools. Many existing elementary schools could be reorganized to contain two or more primary units.

4. *Educational complexes* should be formed, consisting of from two to six primary units clustered around the middle schools. These should be managed by a single administrator, with assistant administrators in the separate unit buildings. The *complexes* should integrate educational activities, improve the distribution of facilities and resources, and promote communication between faculties, parents, and students from diverse ethnic backrounds. *Complexes* should have a high degree of organizational autonomy over their programs.

5. Eventually, educational parks housed in newly developed structures on cleared sites should replace single middle schools with their *educational complexes.*

6. Facilities should be equalized in every way, so that mainly Puerto Rican and Negro schools in the city will *not* continue to be older, more overcrowded, and in greater need of installation of essential facilities than other schools.

7. The new organization of the system should be utilized to stabilize and improve the staffing of the schools. The middle schools and clustered primary units with their new autonomy should be used to attract and retain the best teachers and administrators.

8. Board programs to improve recruitment and advancement of minority group teachers and other personnel should be extended and intensified. As part of this, training relations between the system and local teacher training institutions must be greatly strengthened.

9. Pre-primary programs of instruction should be introduced on a city-wide basis, serving children as young as three years.

10. Special schools and programs, particularly those for maladjusted and retarded students, should be studied independently and

the findings should be made public. A stronger policy for retaining more such students in their regular schools should be pursued.

11. State and Federal support, fiscal and administrative, should be provided to the city to accomplish these necessary changes. This support should begin after the Board of Education has demonstrated its new initiative and commitment by taking some of the steps toward desegregation which do not involve additional municipal expenditures.

Our proposals do, we trust, make plain the fact that substantial forces must be reckoned with and redirected if desegregation is to be achieved. If these proposals are adopted and implemented we are confident they will effect some immediate desegregation. More importantly, they would help prevent an increase in the rate of segregation within the schools. To accomplish this, however, they would have to be introduced promptly, progressively, and in an ever more extensive network during the next five years.

APPENDIX I

Tabular Data on School and Student Ethnic Composition

The ethnic composition of schools in all of the following tables except Table X is classified in the same manner, i.e., white segregated schools contain at least 10% 'Others' but less than 10% Negro and Puerto Rican; desegregated schools contain at least 10% 'Others' and 10% Negro and/or Puerto Ricans; segregated Negro and Puerto Rican schools contain at least 10% Negro and Puerto Ricans but less than 10% 'Others'.

Figures presented in these tables may differ with those of others. Tables presented in this report do not include special school data, and there will be some variation depending upon how combined schools are defined. Percentage totals may vary ±1% due to rounding.

		Page
TABLE I	Percent of 'Other' Students to Total Students in Elementary Schools by Borough and by Year	32
TABLE II	Percent and Number of Total New York City Schools for 1963, by Type of School, Ethnic Composition and Paired Status	32
TABLE III	1963 Enrollment of White and Negro and Puerto Rican Students in Elementary Schools by Ethnic Composition and Borough	33
TABLE IV	1963 Enrollment of White and Negro and Puerto Rican Students in Junior High Schools by Ethnic Composition and Borough	34
TABLE V	1963 Enrollment of White and Negro and Puerto Rican Students in New York City Elementary and Junior High Schools by Ethnic Composition	35
TABLE VI	Percent and Number of Total New York City Schools by Type of School, Ethnic Composition and Year	36
TABLE VII	Percent and Number of Elementary Schools by Borough, Ethnic Composition and Year	37
TABLE VIII	Percent and Number of Junior High Schools by Borough, Ethnic Composition and Year	38
TABLE IX	Percent and Number of Senior High Schools by Borough, Ethnic Composition and Year	39
TABLE X	Percent and Number of Total New York City Schools for 1963 by Type of School and Three Alternative Ethnic Composition Divisions	40

TABLE I

Percent of 'Other' Students to Total Students in Elementary Schools by Borough and by Year

Borough	Year							Projected[1]	
	% 1958	% 1959	% 1960	% 1961	% 1962	% 1963	% Change 58-63	% 1970	% 1980
Bronx	57	53	51	48	46	42	−15	29	16
Brooklyn	64	61	58	55	53	50	−14	36	22
Manhattan	29	26	25	24	24	22	− 7	16	10
Richmond	90	90	90	90	89	89	− 1	89	89
Queens	84	82	81	80	79	77	− 7	69	59
Citywide Total	62	59	57	55	54	51	−11		

[1] These estimates assume no new desegregation efforts and are based on curves fitted by calculus. No citywide estimates are given due to differences in error estimates per borough.

TABLE II

Percent and Number of Total New York City Schools for 1963, by Type of School, Ethnic Composition and Paired Status

Type of School and Ethnic Composition	Paired Status			
	Without Pairing		Paired As Proposed	
	#	%	#	%
ELEMENTARY				
Segregated White[a]	198	34	189	32
Desegregated[b]	260	44	278	47
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican[c]	131	22	122	21
	589	100	589	100
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL				
Segregated White[a]	29	22	28	21
Desegregated[b]	78	59	80	61
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican[c]	25	19	24	18
Total	132	100	132	100

[a] contains at least 10% "others" but less than 10% Negro and Puerto Ricans.

[b] contains at least 10% "others" and 10% Negro and Puerto Ricans.

[c] contains at least 10% Negro and Puerto Ricans but less than 10% "others".

TABLE III

1963 Enrollment of White and Negro Puerto Rican Students in Elementary Schools by Ethnic Composition and Borough

Borough and Ethnic Composition	White		Negro and Puerto Rican		Total Enrollment	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
BRONX						
Segregated White	9,394	19	446	1	9,840	9
Desegregated	36,527	76	28,504	43	65,041	57
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	1,964	4	37,016	56	38,980	34
Total	47,885	100	65,966	100	113,861	100
BROOKLYN						
Segregated White	67,614	60	2,328	2	69,942	31
Desegregated	41,878	37	46,116	42	87,994	40
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	2,656	2	62,342	56	64,764	29
Total	112,148	100	110,786	100	222,700	100
MANHATTAN						
Segregated White	2,464	11	176	0	2,640	3
Desegregated	18,519	85	38,281	47	56,989	57
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	970	4	42,387	53	41,128	40
Total	21,953	100	80,844	100	100,757	100
QUEENS						
Segregated White	68,798	67	2,004	7	70,751	54
Desegregated	33,567	33	15,625	51	49,192	37
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	336	0	12,879	42	12,215	9
Total	102,701	100	30,508	100	132,158	100
RICHMOND						
Segregated White	13,497	75	494	22	13,991	69
Desegregated	4,483	25	1,759	78	6,242	31
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	17,980	100	2,253	100	20,233	100

TABLE IV

1963 Enrollment of White and Negro and Puerto Rican Students in Junior High Schools by Ethnic Composition and Borough

Borough and Ethnic Composition	White		Negro and Puerto Rican		Total Enrollment	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
BRONX						
Segregated White	4,171	21	278	1	4,449	1
Desegregated	15,363	76	12,596	57	28,019	66
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	699	3	9,405	42	10,104	33
Total	20,233	100	22,279	100	42,572	100
BROOKLYN						
Segregated White	17,748	42	932	3	18,680	25
Desegregated	23,419	56	19,939	58	43,344	57
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	673	2	13,411	39	14,084	18
Total	41,840	100	34,282	100	76,108	100
MANHATTAN						
Segregated White	0	0	0	0	0	0
Desegregated	9,362	96	13,170	54	23,284	65
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	457	4	11,318	46	12,527	35
Total	9,819	100	24,488	100	35,811	100
QUEENS						
Segregated White	19,079	50	944	10	20,023	42
Desegregated	19,808	50	6,209	64	25,289	53
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	141	0	2,535	26	2,676	5
Total	38,300	100	9,688	100	47,988	100
RICHMOND						
Segregated White	1,944	42	149	24	2,093	40
Desegregated	2,639	58	0	0	2,639	51
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	0	0	473	76	473	9
Total	4,583	100	622	100	5,205	100

TABLE V

1963 Enrollment of White and Negro and Puerto Rican Students in New York City Elementary and Junior High Schools by Ethnic Composition

Type of School and Ethnic Composition	White		Negro and Puerto Rican		Total Enrollment	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
ELEMENTARY						
Segregated White	161,716	52	5,448	2	167,164	27
Desegregated	142,055	46	130,403	45	265,458	45
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	5,882	2	151,205	53	157,087	27
Total	309,653	100	287,056	100	589,709	100
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL						
Segregated White	42,942	37	2,303	3	45,245	22
Desegregated	70,308	61	52,267	57	122,575	59
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	1,830	2	37,034	40	39,864	19
Total	115,080	100	91,604	100	207,684	100

TABLE VI

Percent and Number of Total New York City Schools, by Type of School, Ethnic Composition and Year

Type of School and Ethnic Composition	Year												Projected	
	1958		1959		1960		1961		1962		1963		1970	1975
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%	%
ELEMENTARY														
Segregated White	253	47	249	45	243	43	226	40	209	36	198	34	24	12
Desegregated	225	41	235	42	227	40	234	42	253	43	260	44	45	50
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	66	12	70	13	95	17	103	18	121	21	131	22	31	38
Total	544	100	554	100	565	100	563	100	583	100	589	100	100	100
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL														
Segregated White	52	43	49	41	46	39	40	33	34	26	29	22	5	0
Desegregated	56	47	58	48	56	47	65	53	76	59	78	59	68	71
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	12	10	13	11	17	14	18	14	19	15	25	19	27	29
Total	120	100	120	100	119	100	123	100	129	100	132	100	100	100
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL														
Segregated White	32	38	31	36	33	38	33	38	29	34	27	31	24	19
Desegregated	53	62	53	62	52	60	52	60	56	64	58	67	72	75
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	0	0	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	4	6
Total	85	100	85	100	86	100	86	100	86	100	86	100	100	100

TABLE VII

Percent and Number of Elementary Schools by Borough, Ethnic Composition and Year

Borough and Ethnic Composition	Year											
	1958		1959		1960		1961		1962		1963	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
BRONX												
Segregated White	30	33	25	27	26	27	22	22	18	18	12	12
Desegregated	49	54	56	60	52	55	61	61	57	56	63	61
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	11	12	12	13	17	18	17	17	27	26	29	28
Total	90	100	93	100	95	100	100	100	102	100	104	100
BROOKLYN												
Segregated White	96	52	88	46	83	43	76	39	73	37	69	35
Desegregated	69	37	82	43	77	40	79	41	81	41	80	40
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	21	11	21	11	33	17	38	20	44	22	51	26
Total	186	100	191	100	193	100	193	100	198	100	200	100
MANHATTAN												
Segregated White	8	10	7	8	6	7	3	3	3	3	3	3
Desegregated	51	61	52	59	51	56	55	59	56	59	55	58
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	25	30	29	33	34	37	35	38	36	38	37	39
Total	84	100	88	100	91	100	93	100	95	100	95	100
QUEENS												
Segregated White	98	64	106	69	106	69	103	71	94	60	92	58
Desegregated	45	30	37	25	37	24	29	20	48	31	52	33
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	9	6	8	5	11	7	13	9	14	9	14	9
Total	152	100	151	100	154	100	145	100	156	100	158	100
RICHMOND												
Segregated White	21	66	23	74	22	69	22	69	21	66	22	69
Desegregated	11	34	8	26	10	31	10	31	11	34	10	31
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	32	100	31	100	32	100	32	100	32	100	32	100

TABLE VIII

Percent and Number of Junior High Schools by Borough, Ethnic Composition and Year

Borough and Ethnic Composition	Year											
	1958		1959		1960		1961		1962		1963	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
BRONX												
Segregated White	10	37	10	37	9	33	9	33	3	11	3	11
Desegregated	15	56	14	52	15	56	14	52	20	74	18	66
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	2	7	3	11	3	11	4	15	4	15	6	22
Total	27	100	27	100	27	100	27	100	27	100	27	100
BROOKLYN												
Segregated White	22	51	19	44	17	40	14	33	14	31	12	25
Desegregated	18	42	21	49	21	50	23	53	25	56	27	56
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	3	7	3	7	4	9	6	14	6	13	9	19
Total	43	100	43	100	42	100	43	100	45	100	48	100
MANHATTAN												
Segregated White	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Desegregated	16	70	17	74	14	61	16	70	16	70	15	65
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	6	26	6	26	9	39	7	30	7	30	8	35
Total	23	100	23	100	23	100	23	100	23	100	23	100
QUEENS												
Segregated White	19	73	19	73	19	73	16	57	15	50	13	42
Desegregated	6	23	6	23	6	23	11	39	13	43	16	52
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	1	4	1	4	1	4	1	4	2	7	2	6
Total	26	100	26	100	26	100	28	100	30	100	31	100
RICHMOND												
Segregated White	0	0	1	100	1	100	1	50	2	50	1	33
Desegregated	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	2	50	2	66
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	100	1	100	1	100	2	100	4	100	3	100

TABLE IX

Percent and Number of Senior High Schools by Borough, Ethnic Composition and Year

Borough and Ethnic Composition	Year											
	1958		1959		1960		1961		1962		1963	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
BRONX												
Segregated White	2	15	2	15	2	15	2	15	2	15	2	15
Desegregated	11	85	10	77	11	85	11	85	11	85	11	85
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	13	100	13	100	13	100	13	100	13	100	13	100
BROOKLYN												
Segregated White	12	41	12	41	12	41	12	41	11	38	10	34
Desegregated	17	59	17	59	16	55	16	55	17	59	18	62
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3
Total	29	100	29	100	29	100	29	100	29	100	29	100
MANHATTAN												
Segregated White	2	10	2	10	2	10	2	10	1	5	1	5
Desegregated	18	90	18	90	18	90	18	90	19	95	19	95
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	20	100	20	100	20	100	20	100	20	100	20	100
QUEENS												
Segregated White	12	67	11	61	13	68	13	68	11	58	10	53
Desegregated	6	33	7	39	6	32	6	32	8	42	9	47
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	18	100	18	100	19	100	19	100	19	100	19	100
RICHMOND												
Segregated White	4	80	4	80	4	80	4	80	4	80	4	80
Desegregated	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	5	100	5	100	5	100	5	100	5	100	5	100

TABLE X

Percent and Number of Total New York City Schools for 1963 by Type School and Three Alternative Ethnic Composition Divisions

Type of School and Ethnic Composition	10%-90%[1]		20%-80%[2]		30%-70%[3]	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
ELEMENTARY						
Segregated White	198	34	261	44	304	52
Desegregated	260	44	158	27	102	17
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	131	22	170	29	183	31
Total	589	100	589	100	589	100
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL						
Segregated White	29	22	47	36	63	48
Desegregated	78	59	49	37	26	20
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	25	19	36	27	43	32
Total	132	100	132	100	132	100
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL						
Segregated White	27	31	37	42	48	56
Desegregated	58	67	46	53	27	31
Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican	1	2	3	4	11	13
Total	86	100	86	100	86	100

1. Same Ethnic Composition as used in previous tables.

2. Segregated White schools contain at least 20% "Other" but less than 20% Negro and Puerto Rican.

Desegregated schools contain at least 20% "Other" and 20% Negro and Puerto Rican.

Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican schools contain at least 20% Negro and Puerto Rican but less than 20% "Other".

3. Segregated White schools contain at least 30% "Other" but less than 30% Negro and Puerto Rican.

Desegregated schools contain at least 30% "Other" and 30% Negro and Puerto Rican.

Segregated Negro and Puerto Rican schools contain at least 30% Negro and Puerto Rican but less than 30% "Other".

APPENDIX II

Some Proposed Educational Complexes

This list of grouped schools represents a selection of possible educational complexes that could be developed according to the method described in the text of this report. Each complex contains two or more elementary schools and one or more junior high schools. Junior high schools would become middle schools as described in the text of this report.

PROPOSED EDUCATIONAL COMPLEXES

Bronx	District	School	1963 White Enrollment	1963 Negro and P.R. Enrollment
1.	22	24	654	1
	22	141	534	2
	22	J141	939	34
2.	22	7	467	80
	22	122	838	197
	22	J143	1284	241
3.	22	85	572	524
	22	115	175	21
	22	59	323	789
	22	33	634	156
	22	J115	690	291
4.	21	6	404	878
	21	44	58	42
	21	67	576	1,047
	21	92	511	1,075
	21	57	493	675
	21	J118	167	808
	21	J44	421	698
5.	19	88	333	159
	19	53	293	641
	19	90	713	705
	19	2	27	1,025
	19	63	4	1,243
	19	132	55	973
	19	J55	46	1,153
	19	J22	1,069	673
6.	24	68	677	103
	24	111	280	363
	24	112	185	506
	24	J142	1,046	736

Bronx	District	School	1963 White Enrollment	1963 Negro and P.R. Enrollment
7.	18	36	666	388
	18	119	329	194
	18	138	744	176
	18	J125	753	895
8.	22	8	627	129
	22	80	316	27
	22	94/56	1,022	195
	22	J80	1,016	303
9.	20	28	791	398
	20	4	54	1220
	20	42	16	1008
	20	58	112	938
	20	70	806	457
	20	J117	1108	438

Some Proposed Educational Complexes

Brooklyn	District	School	1963 White Enrollment	1963 Negro and P.R. Enrollment
1.	28	2	176	870
	28	94	883	120
	28	J136	508	447
2.	41	189	535	615
	41	156	324	2,530
	41	219	1,103	228
	41	J252	660	738
	42	175	59	2,047
	42	183	260	1,396
3.	43	182	477	1,295
	43	190	951	657
	43	213	1,003	213
	43	260	209	583
	43	J149	382	1,176
	44	158	400	1,642
4.	44	65	322	30
	44	108	568	125
	44	171	487	10
	44	J171	798	121
5.	26	J51	623	766
	28	39	448	84
	25	77	447	341
	25	282/4	265	1,029
6.	39	80	488	517
	39	188	975	389
	39	288	841	640
	39	J239	1,539	471
7.	35	92	1,275	474
	27	161	546	622
	27	J27/61	778	1,131
8.	41	233	862	189
	42	165	343	577
	42	J275	115	492
9.	30	132	410	588
	31	18	117	303
	31	196/36	242	876
	31	J49	231	1,616

Brooklyn	District	School	1963 White Enrollment	1963 Negro and P.R. Enrollment
10.	33	53	366	210
	33	86	473	116
	33	123	868	435
	33	J162	1,036	274
11.	44	202	832	1,172
	44	224	886	409
	44	273	830	160
	44	J166	1,215	959
12.	44	159	690	678
	44	214	311	11
	44	J214	759	156
Total				

Some Proposed Educational Complexes

Manhattan	District	School	1963 White Enrollment	1963 Negro and P.R. Enrollment
1.	5	19	356	426
	5	61	318	856
	4	122	214	290
	5	J60	439	920
2.	2	31	76	878
	3	110	398	382
	3	134	273	822
	3	J12	563	963
3.	8	69	133	78
	8	111	292	500
	6	J17	370	617
4.	2	1	332	504
	2	2	396	750
	2	42	450	473
	2	177	261	485
	2	J65	972	561
5.	8	75	445	294
	8	84	328	583
	8	166	432	337
	8	J118	369	941
6.	9	151	313	124
	9	198/86	268	834

Some Proposed Educational Complexes

Queens	District	School	1963 White Enrollment	1963 Negro and P.R. Enrollment
1.	46	111	230	810
	46	112	716	142
	46	166	531	305
	46	J204	721	641
2.	48	92	2	495
	45	127	45	709
	45	148	1,049	152
	45	149	920	137
3.	51	82	370	22
	51	117	1,414	38
	51	170	430	16
	51	J217	1,446	236
4.	51	109	94	0
	51	135	1,186	15
	51	J109	1,667	51
5.	50	96	120	301
	49	100	1,060	56
	49	108	670	23
	50	121	841	403
	50	155	66	822
	50	124	555	534
6.	46	9	99	195
	46	7	461	128
	46	5	785	15
	46	171	377	474
	46	J126	976	384
7.	48	14	711	82
	48	19	866	326
	48	143	69	538
	48	J16	526	318
8.	50	50	101	766
	50	55	643	45
	50	48	13	591
9.	50	34	665	35
	50	134	222	845
	50	136	34	1,117
	50	147	742	572

Some Proposed Educational Complexes

Queens	District	School	1963 White Enrollment	1963 Negro and P.R. Enrollment
10.	50	J192	421	1,054
	50	15	6	665
	50	37	105	577
	50	132	375	285
	50	161	61	429
	50	156	1,436	103
	50	J59	1,125	758
11.	50	52	742	195
	50	137	257	2
	50	J231	1,119	525
12.	49	42	886	483
	49	105	1,251	331
	49	183/47	290	733
	49	J198	1,505	300